

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Neighborhood Learning Place

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Unsatisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Unsatisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 2:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

Neighborhood Learning Place submitted a corrective action plan that a) provided a description of the ways in which NLP will provide additional support and training to tutors in how to effectively use NLP's curriculum and instructional methods as well as effective classroom and behavior management, and b) shared the process that NLP will use to evaluate the effectiveness of tutors in implementing the program appropriately and accurately (which would include ensuring tutoring session length is consistent), as well as consequences that will be utilized for tutors who are not performing appropriately.

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Neighborhood Learning Place's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Neighborhood Learning Place
SITE: Village Elementary School (East Allen County Schools)
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 1 tutor
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1

DATE: April 11, 2007
REVIEWER: ST/MC
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 2:35pm

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X	<p>One tutor was paired with two students. One student had already completed his lessons with the tutor (although tutoring had only begun at 2:00). The other student worked on reading lessons with the tutor. This student completed a workbook page on detecting the sequence and order of events based on a story selection he had read. The tutor assisted the student with questions he had difficulty answering. The student also worked on a reading/vocabulary comprehension worksheet that required using context clues from the reading selection to determine the definition of a word and then determine whether the word was an appropriate option to complete sentences on the worksheet.</p> <p>The observed lesson content was consistent with the provider application. However, it was not always apparent that the student received the level of instruction he needed to receive in order to master the concepts being taught (see "Instruction is Clear" section below). The tutor did not appear to implement all elements of the Direct Instructional Model as described in the application. Namely, it was not evident that the tutor clearly communicated the objectives of the lesson, effectively demonstrated the skill, or checked for understanding as described in the provider application. In addition, according to the tutoring schedule, each student should have received at least 2 hours of tutoring. However, as stated above, one student received 30 minutes or less of tutoring since his lessons had been completed before reviewers arrived.</p>
Instruction is clear		X	<p>Tutor was able to clarify what some of the workbook page or worksheets were asking the student to do when the student was unclear. However, it was not always evident the tutor was able to provide the student with resources to determine the correct answers on his own. For instance, the student had a great deal of difficulty with the vocabulary recognition and application worksheet, but rather than encouraging the student to use context clues or employ other reading comprehension skills, the tutor repeatedly told the student to "read the definition". In addition, sometimes the student would state an answer, the tutor would share this was incorrect, and then the student would provide another answer (or two) and so on until the correct answer was selected (sort of a trial and error method). In these situations, the tutor did not clarify that the student truly understood why his answers were incorrect and why the answer selected (or in some cases guessed) was</p>

			correct.
Time on task is appropriate	X		For the most part, the student working with the tutor remained on task. However, the student that had completed his lessons was off task the entire observed session (except for the few minutes when the tutor asked him about one of his library books). This student was a distraction as he roamed the room aimlessly, played with an airplane, and disturbed art projects in the room with very little redirection or supervision from the tutor who was engaged with working with the other student.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		As described in the application, the tutor provided a parent of one of the students with a summary of what the student worked on during the tutoring session, made suggestions on activities the parent could work on with the child at home and also provided feedback on the student's success level during the session before the student went home with his parent. However, the tutor did not implement all elements of the Direct Instructional Model as described in the application. See comments in "Lesson matches provider application" section above. Moreover, the tutor appeared to have some difficulty managing the behavior of the student who had completed his lesson and keeping him from distracting the other student (see Time on task is appropriate, above).
Student/instructor ratio: <u>2:1</u>	X		Application describes ratio as 2:1 and small group instruction. Ratio observed matched description in original application.